

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/552,675	08/15/2006	Daniel Baumgartner	001227/0954	2286	
69095 STROOCK &	7590 09/02/200 STROOCK & LAVAN	EXAM	EXAMINER		
180 MAIDEN LANE			MERENE, JAN CHRISTOP L		
NEW YORK,	NY 10038		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3733		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/02/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)						
10/552,675	BAUMGARTNER ET AL.						
Examiner	Art Unit						
JAN CHRISTOPHER MERENE	3733						

Derore the rining of an Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	JAN CHRISTOPHER MERENE	3733					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	g date of the final rejection. dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, whi	chever is later. In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was the filed was seen filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons with it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4.133(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but (see below).	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Eduardo C. Robert/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733	/Jan Christopher Merei Examiner, Art Unit 3733 8/22/2008	ne/					

The applicant alleges that Rabbe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the end member is "slidably movable" with respect to the spacer body, rather that Rabbe discloses an interverterbal implant consisted of a threaded body #21 and a threaded hate #22 rotatable #22 rotatable #22 rotatable #22 rotatable with respect to the spacer body, rather that Rabbe discloses an interverterbal implant consisted of a threaded body #21 and a threaded hate #21 rotatable what "slidably movable" is in the specification. The examiner realed that limitation with the broadest reasonable interpretation of the plain meaning of the phrase "slidably movable". The examiner would like to point out that as the endplate #22 of Rabbe is threaded along the body #21 that the endplate #22 it is slidably moving along the the threads of body #21, therefore meeting the limitation of the end member being "slidably movable." As such, the implant of Rabbe would be capable of being movable between a first and second position, wherein the spikes would extend beyond the end surface of the body #21. Like wise, the endfaces of the body #21 would also be capable of contacting at least a portion of the vertibar (i.e. if the end plates are slidably moved towards each other along body, where the spikes do not extend beyond the end surface of body #21 and where the endface of body #21 would be capable of contacting at least a portion of an upper and lower vertebral. As such, the 103 relections made are also deemed appropriate.

With regard the statement of intended use and other functional statements, they do not impose any structural limitations on the claims distinguishable over the art of record which is capable of being used as claimed if one so desires to do so. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Furthermore, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches, but rather it is only necessary that the claims under attack "read on" something in the reference. Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp., 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983).

Furthermore, the manner in which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).